

Serial No.: 10/823,674
Docket No.: 102-1024
Amendment dated March 22, 2011
Reply to the Office Action of December 22, 2010

REMARKS

Introduction

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 1-16 are allowable.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-18 and 21 are pending in the application. Claim 17 has been amended. Claims 19 and 20 have been previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are requested.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103

Claims 17, 18 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi et al. "New Frame Rate Up-Conversion Using Bi-Directional Motion Estimation," I.E.E.E. Transactions on Consumer Electronics, Vol. 46, No. 3, (hereinafter, "Choi") in view of Heising et al., "Wavelet-based Very Low Bit Rate Video Coding Using Image Warping and Overlapped Block Motion Compensation" I.E.E.E. Proceedings: Vision, Image and Signal Processing, Vol. 148, No. 2, April 2001, (hereinafter, "Heising"). In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

Claim 17

Referring to independent claim 17, in the Office Action dated December 22, 2010, the Examiner alleges that Choi and Heising in combination with one another disclose all the limitations recited in independent claim 17. It is respectfully requested that Choi and Heising, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, do not teach or suggest all of the features as presently recited in independent claim 17, for at least the following reasons.

Serial No.: 10/823,674
Docket No.: 102-1024
Amendment dated March 22, 2011
Reply to the Office Action of December 22, 2010

Referring to page 6 of the March 4, 2010 Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges and Applicants agree that the combination of Choi and Heising do not teach or suggest “a final interpolation pixel selector to select one among the first interpolation pixel and the candidate interpolation pixel as a final interpolation pixel according to the result determined at the motion analyzer by comparing a deviation of the motion vectors of the current and the peripheral blocks, and to output the selected final interpolation pixel.” Applicants submit that as the Examiner acknowledges that Choi and Heising in combination with one another do not teach or suggest “comparing a deviation” of the “motion vectors” of the “current and the peripheral blocks” to “select one among the first interpolation pixel and the candidate interpolation pixel” as a “final interpolation pixel” and “output[ting] the selected final interpolation pixel,” Applicants submit that Choi and Heising, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, do not teach or suggest “comparing a deviation” between “motion vectors” of a “current block” and “peripheral blocks,” and “outputting a final interpolation pixel” that is “selected from among the first interpolation pixel and the candidate interpolation pixel” according to the “compared deviation.”

Therefore, Choi and Heising, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, do not teach or suggest, among other things, that “the selecting of the discontinuous areas includes comparing a deviation between motion vectors of a current block and peripheral blocks, and outputting a final interpolation pixel that is selected from among the first interpolation pixel and the candidate interpolation pixel according to the compared deviation” as presently recited in independent claim 17.

Since Choi and Heising, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, do not teach or suggest all of the features as recited in independent claim 17, claim 17 is patentably distinguishable and deemed to be allowable.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

Claims 18 and 21

With regard to claims 18 and 21, it is requested that for at least the reasons that these

Serial No.: 10/823,674
Docket No.: 102-1024
Amendment dated March 22, 2011
Reply to the Office Action of December 22, 2010

claims depend from allowable independent claim 17, and therefore contain each of the features as recited in claim 17, claims 18 and 21 are also patentable over Choi and Heising, whether taken alone or in combination with one another.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

Examiner's Response to Arguments

In the Remarks above, Applicants address the Examiner's Response to Arguments recited on pages 2-3 of the Office Action, as well as the rejections recited on pages 3-7 of the Office Action. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the above remarks is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.


Serial No.: 10/823,674
Docket No.: 102-1024
Amendment dated March 22, 2011
Reply to the Office Action of December 22, 2010

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 502827.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Dated: March 22, 2011
919 18th St., NW, Suite 440
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 775-1900
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901

By: 
Kevin T. Roddy
Registration No. 50,577